UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,203	11/25/2003	Markus Schmidt-Karaca	11884/407701	4988

53000   7590   05/01/2008
KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
HOANG, HIEU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 February 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to the communication filed on 02/25/2008.

2.   Claims 16 and 17 are new.

3.   Claims 1-17 are pending and presented for examination.

Response to Amendment

4.   The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claims 10 and 12. See rationale in the U.S.C.

rejection section below.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of new

ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

6.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities. Claim 9

recites a computer-readable medium. However, no explicit definition of a computer-

readable medium can be found in the specification. For examining purpose, the claimed

computer-readable medium will be read as a storage device as in par. 1 of the Detailed

Description. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

7.   Claim 9 is objected to because of the same rationale given above in the

specification objection. No explicit definition of a computer-readable medium can be

found in the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.   Claims 1-4, 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Consider claim 1, the claim recites storing <u>at least</u>

one application descriptor, and the application descriptor maintains a complete

representation of <u>all</u> distributed applications in the network. If one application descriptor

maintains a complete representation of <u>all</u> distributed applications in the network, it is

vague why there are multiple application descriptors in a same network. It is also vague

which application descriptor the applicant is referring by reciting <u>the</u> application

descriptor. Same rejection rationale applies to claim 12.

10.   Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between

the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: although the claims

are system claims, there is no explicit connection or relationship between the

components of the claims, e.g., between the server and the database. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

12.   Claims 1-4 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Caufield et al. (US 2007/0177571, hereafter Caufield), in view of Chasman et al.

(US 2007/0180075, hereafter Chasman), further in view of Kjellberg et al. (US

2003/0084165, hereafter Kjellberg).

13.   For claim 1, Caufield discloses a method for representing a distributed software

application comprising:

        each computing device is associated with at least one resource ([0024] lines 1-7,

[0028] lines 6-21, [0026], association between the user ID and device ID and

components);

        storing at least one application descriptor, wherein the application descriptor

describes the association between each of the at least one computing device

participating in the application and each of the respective resources ([0024] lines 1-7,

[0028] lines 6-21, association between the user ID of the device and component or

resources that the user device is allowed to synchronize with the server, [0026], user ID

is associated with device ID);

providing access to the application descriptor in order to automatically configure the at least one computing device (fig. 2, [0024], abstract, meta-data relationship for roles, device, and component association for synchronizing or configuring the device).

Caufield does not explicitly disclose:

determining at least one distributed application in a network, the application including the collective behavior of at least one computing device;

However, Chasman discloses:

determining at least one distributed application in a network (fig. 4, update request message containing a business object type of sales opportunity for sales applications), the application including the collective behavior of at least one computing device (fig. 4, mobile device requesting update information or collective behavior);

Caufield-Chasman does not disclose providing access to the application descriptor in order to facilitate administration of the distributed software application; and the application descriptor maintains a complete representation of all distributed applications in the network.

However, Kjellberg discloses providing access to the application descriptor in order to facilitate administration of the distributed software application (fig. 1, [0026], application provisioning interface 280 connected to the descriptor database for provisioning or administration of distributed application).

the application descriptor maintains a complete representation of all distributed applications in the network ([0026], fig. 1, application descriptor database storing all application descriptors).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of Caufield and Chasman and Kjellberg to utilize the

role-device-component relationships of Caufield to authorize users and devices to

access a particular data type in the synchronization process.

14.   For claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 1.

15.   For claims 2 and 13, the claims are rejected as in claims 1, 5, and 12. Caufield-

Chasman-Kjellberg further discloses the application descriptor is stored at a network

node, the network node performing administrative tasks with respect to the distributed

application (Caufield, fig. 1, network server, distributing data by synchronization upon

request).

16.   For claims 3 and 14, the claims are rejected as in claims 1, 5, and 12. Caufield-

Chasman-Kjellberg further discloses the application descriptor is used for at least one of

configuration, deployment of the distributed application (Caufield, abstract,

synchronization).

17.   For claims 4 and 15, the claims are rejected as in claims 1 and 12. Caufield-Chasman-Kjellberg further discloses the distributed application is installed on a network including an application server, a middleware server and a mobile device (Caufield, fig. 1, application server, access server and mobile device).

18.   For claims 16 and 17, the claims are rejected as in claims 1 and 12. Caufield-Chasman-Kjellberg further discloses the complete representation comprises respective resources required for all the distributed applications with respect to all participating devices (Kjellberg, fig. 1, [0026], application descriptor database for association of devices and application objects)

19.   Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chasman, in view of Caufield, further in view of Kjellberg.

20.   For claim 5, Chasman discloses a method for representing a software application operating within a mobile environment, the mobile application including the collective behavior of a mobile device a middleware server and a backend server comprising:

        specifying a behavior for the mobile device (fig. 4, receiving update request including user inputs at the device);

determining at least one first resource to be associated with mobile device, at least one second resource to be associated with the middleware server and at least one third resource to be associated with the backend server as a function of the specified behavior for the mobile device (fig. 4 and 7, [0024], [0031], identifiers for resources at the mobile device, the application server and the master database, after receiving the update request, determining resource or data to be synchronized by comparing the update request with the master database and send the synchronized data to the client device);

Chasman does not explicitly disclose:

storing an application descriptor, the application descriptor describing the association between the first resource, the second resource, the third resource and, respectively, the mobile device, the middleware server and the backend server;

However, Caufield discloses:

storing an application descriptor, the application descriptor describing the association between the first resource, the second resource, the third resource and, respectively, the mobile device, the middleware server and the backend server ([0024] lines 1-7, [0028] lines 6-21, [0026], association between the user ID and device ID and component or resources that the user device is allowed to synchronize with the master database)

Chasman-Caufield does not disclose the application descriptor maintaining a complete representation of all software applications in the mobile environment.

However, Kjellberg discloses the same ([0026], fig. 1, application descriptor database storing all descriptors for applications)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Chasman and Caufield and Kjellberg to utilize the role-device-component relationships of Caufield to allow users and devices to access a particular data type in the synchronization process.

21.   For claim 6, the claim is rejected as in claim 5. Chasman-Caufield-Kjellberg further discloses the application descriptor is stored at a network node, the network node performing administrative tasks with respect to the distributed application (Caufield, fig. 1, network server, distributing data by synchronization upon request).

22.   For claim 7, the claims are rejected as in claim 5. Chasman-Caufield-Kjellberg further discloses the application descriptor is used for at least one of configuration, deployment of the distributed application (Caufield, abstract, synchronization).

23.   For claim 8, Chasman-Caufield-Kjellberg further discloses the at least one first

resource, the at least one second resource and the at least one third resource are

deployed to at least one of the mobile device, the middleware server and the backend

server as a function of the application descriptor (Caufield, fig. 2, abstract,

synchronizing application data between application server and mobile devices based on

role-device-components association).

24.   Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kjellberg, in view of Chasman.

25.   For claim 9, Kjellberg discloses a computer-readable medium storing thereon

program instructions that, when executed, cause an executing device to form a data

structure for representing a distributed software an application descriptor, the

application descriptor storing a complete representation of all distributed applications

existing in a network, the data structure including:

        a first unique identifier for representing a software application distributed in the

network ([0024] last 4 lines, [0025], a client software version is an software application

ID);

        at least one second unique identifier specifying at least one computing device

(fig. 1, [0026], device profile database 240 storing device identifiers), wherein the

second identifier is associated with the first unique identifier ([0026], fig. 1, application

descriptor associated with the application and device profile);

at least one third unique identifier specifying at least one resource ([0029],

application menu of available resources (objects and applications) for associated user

and device profile);

an association between each of the at least one computing device and the at

least one resource ([0026], application descriptor is accessed to determine which

application or objects is associated with the device)

Kjellberg does not disclose explicitly that the at least one computing device to

participate in the software application.

However, Chasman discloses the same (fig. 4, application version synchronizing

request of a business object or application)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to

combine the teachings of Kjellberg and Chasman to synchronize the user device with

the latest version of applications using out-of-date detection and conflict detection of

Chasman.

26.   For claim 10, Kjellberg discloses a system for administering a distributed

software application including the collective behavior of a plurality of computing devices

within a network comprising:

a server including a processor (fig. 1, provisioning server);

a database for storing at least one application descriptor (fig. 1, descriptor

database 250), the at least one application descriptor representing an association

between the distributed software application, computing devices and resources to be

associated with the computing devices ([0026], application descriptor is accessed to

determine which application or objects is associated with the device); and the at least

one application descriptor maintains a complete representation of all distributed

software applications in the network (fig. 1, descriptor database for all applications

available).

at least one administrative module on the server, wherein the processor, utilizing

the at least one administrative module and the at least one application descriptor,

perform administration tasks for the application with respect to the computing devices

([fig. 1, application configuration interface 280 allows administration of software

applications using application descriptor database 250, using device profile database

230)

Kjellberg does not disclose explicitly that the computing devices participating in

the distributed software application.

However, Chasman discloses the same (fig. 4, application synchronizing request

of a business object)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to

combine the teachings of Kjellberg and Chasman to synchronize the user device with

the latest version of applications using out-of-date detection and conflict detection of

Chasman.

27.   For claim 11, the claim is rejected as in claim 10. Kjellberg-Chasman further

discloses the administrative tasks include at least one of configuration, deployment, and

updating of the distributed software application (Chasman, abstract, synchronization

and updating, Kjellberg, fig. 1, item 270, deployment of distributed application).

Conclusion

28.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

       Pace et al. US 2003/0101223.

       DaCosta et al. US 2002/0120725.

       Johnson et al. US 2003/0120784.

29.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

    A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

30.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-

1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m.,

EST.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 15

HH

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152